



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,956	02/04/2004	Muntaser Q. Majdoub		5116
37476	7590	01/09/2007		EXAMINER
WHITE-WELKER & WELKER, LLC			AMADIZ, RODNEY	
P.O. BOX 199			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CLEAR SPRING, MD 21722-0199			2629	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/09/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/771,956	MAJDOUN, MUNTASER Q.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Rodney Amadiz	2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/4/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 18 and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities: As to Claim 3, it is noted that the applicant has misnumbered the claims starting with Claim 3 (i.e. claim 2 is omitted (does not exist)). Therefore, Claim 3 should be labeled Claim 2. Furthermore Claim 3 is dependent upon Claim 2 but because Claim 2 does not exist it is assumed that Claim 3 is dependent upon Claim 1 not Claim 2.
2. The Claims will be treated with the respective numbers as they appear in the present application.

Claim 4, line 3, replace the word "letter" with -letters-

Claim 4, line 5, replace the word "place" with -placed-

Claim 6, line 2, replace the word "a" with -an-

Claim 7, line 2, replace the word "a" with -an-

Claim 18, line 3, replace the word "are" with -when-

Claim 19 depends upon itself and should depend upon claim 18. Also, lines 2 and 3 of Claim 19 reads: "wherein the bottom side input means exposed while the in the closed position is comprised of a numerical keypad" should be changed to:

— wherein the bottom side input means is exposed while ~~the~~ in the closed position and is comprises of a numerical keypad—

Many claims in this application contain grammatical errors as shown above and should be carefully reviewed and corrected upon submission.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. Claim 14 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 14 is almost identical to Claim 9 and since the claim tree is written so that claim 14 depends upon preceding claims that depend upon Claim 9 then Claim 14 fails to further limit the subject matter of Claim 9.

4. Claim 20 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim (See Claim 18). See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim has not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

| is

6. Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chuang
^
(USPGPUB 2004/0207604—herein referred to as “Chuang”).

As to Claim 1, Chuang teaches An electronic device comprising: (a) a main unit to provide data processing function and a display screen (***Fig. 4, Reference Numbers 2, 51 and 52 and Pg. 1, ¶ 17 and 18***); (b) two input means arranged around the main unit on opposing sides (***Fig. 4, Reference Numbers 31 and 32***); (c) input means are coupled to the main unit so as to be movable relative thereto between an open position in which input means protrude from the main unit allowing for input operation and a closed position where the input means is stored and protected, wherein input means slide between the open and closed positions and are retracted into slots on each the side of the main unit (***Fig. 4, Reference Numbers 31 and 32 and Pg. 2, ¶'s 21-24***).

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Madsen et al. (U.S. Patent 7,031,143—herein referred to as “Madsen”).

As to Claim 16, Madsen teaches an electronic device comprising: (a) a main unit to provide data processing function and a display screen (**Figs. 6 and 7, Reference Numbers 10 and 32**); (b) two input means arranged around the main unit on opposing sides, wherein the input means is comprised of two panels, each respectively extended from the main unit of the electronic device having a top side and bottom side (**Figs. 6 and 7, Reference Numbers 44A and 44B and Col. 2, lines 44-52**); (c) input means are coupled to the main unit so as to be movable relative thereto between an open position in which input means protrudes from the main unit allowing for input operation and a closed position where the top side of the input means is stored and protected (**See Figs. 6-10**), wherein input means rotates between the open and closed positions and when in the closed position, covers a portion of the main unit (**See Figs. 1-9 and Col. 2, line 65—Col. 3, line 10**) .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madsen in view of Chuang.

As to Claim 1, Madsen teaches an electronic device comprising: (a) a main unit to provide data processing function and a display screen (*Figs. 6 and 7, Reference Numbers 10 and 32*; (b) two input means arranged around the main unit on opposing sides (*Figs. 6 and 7, Reference Numbers 44A and 44B and Col. 2, lines 44-52*); (c) input means are coupled to the main unit so as to be movable relative thereto between an open position in which input means protrude from the main unit allowing for input operation and a closed position where the input means is stored and protected (See *Figs. 6-10*). Madsen, however, does not teach the input means sliding between an open position and a closed position from slots on the side of the main unit. Examiner cites Chuang to teach two input means sliding between an open position and a closed position from slots on the side of the main unit (*Chuang—Fig. 4, Reference Numbers 31 and 32 and Pg. 2, ¶'s 21-24*). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to change the manner in which the input means open and close to sliding means as taught by Chuang in the electronic

device taught by Madsen in order to better protect the input means and enhance flexibility and ease of use of the electronic device (*Chuang—Pg. 2, ¶ 25*).

10. Claims 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madsen and Chuang as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (U.S. Patent 6,398,437—herein referred to as “Yamazaki”).

As to **Claim 3**, Madsen teaches the input means containing standard buttons and numbers (*See Figs. 6 and 7*). Madsen however, does not teach a mouse button and a mouse stick. Examiner cites Yamazaki to teach a mouse buttons and mouse stick disposed on an input device (*Yamazaki—Fig. 2, Reference numbers 55 and 57 and Col. 3, lines 49-54*). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the use of a mouse stick and mouse buttons as taught by Yamazaki in the electronic device taught by Madsen, as modified by Chuang, in order to provide additional functionality to the device thereby adding a commonly used electronic attribute (cursor control) that enhances the way the user inputs information.

As to **Claim 4**, Madsen teaches the input means comprised of two panels (*Fig. 6, Reference Numbers 44A and 44B*), each respectively extended from the main unit of the electronic device, each panel containing standard letter and numbers (*Fig. 6, Reference Numbers 44A and 44B*); the two panels can be combined to form a standard keyboard and are basically two halves of a standard keyboard divide into two sections and placed in a opposite orientation around the main unit (*Fig. 6, Reference*

Numbers 44A and 44B and Col. 43-52).

As to **Claim 5**, Madsen, as modified by Chuang, fails to teach the two panels containing one or more mouse buttons and mouse sticks. Examiner cites Yamazaki to teach a mouse buttons and mouse stick disposed on an input device (**Yamazaki—Fig. 2, Reference numbers 55 and 57 and Col. 3, lines 49-54**). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the use of a mouse stick and mouse buttons as taught by Yamazaki on both input means taught by Madsen as modified by Chuang in order to provide additional functionality to the device thereby adding a commonly used electronic attribute (cursor control) that enhances the way the user inputs information.

As to **Claim 6**, Madsen teaches the two panels arranged in an orientation such that one panel is on the left of the display screen and one panel is on the right of the display screen (**See Figs. 6 and 7**).

As to **Claim 7**, Madsen teaches the two panels arranged in an orientation such that one panel is on top of the display screen and one panel is on the bottom of the display screen (**See Fig. 6—depending on how the user holds the device the panels can be on the left/right or top/bottom of the display screen**).

11. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chuang in view of Kwon (WO 01/84728—herein referred to as “Kwon”).

As to **Claim 8**, Chuang teaches an electronic device comprising: (a) a main unit to provide data processing function, and a display screen (**Fig. 4, Reference Numbers**

2, 51 and 52 and Pg. 1, ¶ 17 and 18; (b) two input means arranged around the main unit on opposing sides (**Fig. 4, Reference Numbers 31 and 32**); (c) input means are coupled to the main unit so as to be movable relative thereto between an open position in which input means protrude from the main unit allowing for input operation and a closed position wherein the input means are stored and protected within the main unit, wherein input means slide between the open and closed positions and are retracted into slots on each the side of the main unit (**Fig. 4, Reference Numbers 31 and 32 and Pg. 2, ¶'s 21-24**). Chuang, however fails to teach the main unit comprising a keypad input system. Examiner cites Kwon to teach a main unit comprising a keypad input system (**Kwon—Figs. 2 and 3 and Pg. 2, lines 23-26 and Pg. 3, lines 15-19**). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add a keypad in the input system as taught by Kwon in the electronic device taught by Chuang so that the user may easily use the device as a mobile phone when needed.

12. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chuang and Kwon as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Yamazaki et al.

As to **Claim 9**, Chuang teaches the input means containing standard buttons and numbers (See Fig. 3). Chuang, as modified by Kwon, however, fail to teach a mouse button and a mouse stick. Examiner cites Yamazaki to teach a mouse buttons and mouse stick disposed on an input device (**Yamazaki—Fig. 2, Reference numbers 55 and 57 and Col. 3, lines 49-54**). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the use of a mouse

stick and mouse buttons as taught by Yamazaki in the electronic device taught by Chuang, as modified by Kwon, in order to provide additional functionality to the device thereby adding a commonly used electronic attribute (cursor control) that enhances the way the user inputs information.

As to **Claim 10**, Chuang teaches the input means comprised of two panels, each respectively extended from the main unit of the electronic device (**See Fig. 4, Reference Numbers 31 and 32**), each panel containing standard letter and numbers (**See Fig. 3**).

13. Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chuang, Kwon and Yamazaki as applied to claims 9 and 10 above, and further in view of Madsen.

As to **Claim 11**, Chuang teaches two panels placed in an opposite orientation around the main unit (**See Fig. 4**), Chuang, as modified by Kwon and Yamazaki, however, fails to teach that the two panels can be combined to form a standard keyboard and are basically two halves of a standard keyboard divided into two sections. Examiner cites Madsen to teach two panels combined to form a standard keyboard and that are two halves of a standard keyboard divided into two sections (**Madsen—Figs. 6 and 7, Reference Numbers 44A and 44B and Col. 2, lines 43-52**). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the two sections combine to form a standard keyboard as taught by Madsen in the

electronic device taught by Chuang, as modified by Kwon and Yamazaki so that the user may input information in a way that is familiar and well known to the common user.

As to **Claim 12**, Chuang, as modified by Yamazaki and Madsen, fails to teach the two panels in conjunction with the keypad of the main until can be combined to form a standard keyboard and are basically each one third of a standard keyboard divide into three sections and place in an orientation around the main unit so as to be aligned to form a standard board. Examiner cites Kwon to teach two panels in conjunction with the keypad of a main until can be combined to form a standard keyboard and are basically each one third of a standard keyboard divide into three sections and place in an orientation around the main unit so as to be aligned to form a standard board

(**Kwon—Fig. 4, Reference Numbers 8 and 9 and Pg. 7, line 22—Pg. 8, line 3**). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the three sections combined to form a standard keyboard as taught by Kwon in the electronic device taught by Chuang, as modified by Yamazaki and Madsen so that the user may input information in a way that is familiar and well known to the common user.

As to **Claim 13**, Kwon teaches the main unit keypad contains a numerical phone pad and is fully functional when the two panels are in the closed ***position*** (**Kwon—See Fig. 3 and note the two panels in the closed position**).

As to **Claim 14**, all the limitations have already been addressed with respect to claim 9.

As to **Claim 15**, Chuang teaches the two panels arranged in an orientation such that one panel is on the left of the display screen and one panel is on the right of the display screen (***Chuang—See Fig. 4, Panels 31 and 32***).

14. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madsen in view of Yamazaki.

As to **Claim 17**, Madsen teaches the top side input means containing standard buttons and numbers (***See Figs. 6 and 7***). Madsen however, does not teach a mouse button and a mouse stick. Examiner cites Yamazaki to teach a mouse buttons and mouse stick disposed on an input device (***Yamazaki—Fig. 2, Reference numbers 55 and 57 and Col. 3, lines 49-54***). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the use of a mouse stick and mouse buttons as taught by Yamazaki in the electronic device taught by Madsen in order to provide additional functionality to the device thereby adding a commonly used electronic attribute (cursor control) that enhances the way the user inputs information.

15. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madsen and Yamazaki as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Ostergard et al. (U.S. Patent 6,760,015—herein referred to as “Ostergard”).

As to **Claim 18**, Madsen, as modified by Yamazaki, fails to teach the bottom side comprising input means which contains standard buttons and numbers that can be

utilized for input means when in a closed position. Examiner cites Ostegard to teach the bottom side of an input panel comprising input means which contains standard buttons and numbers that can be utilized for input means when in a closed position

(**Ostegard—See Figs. 2a and 2b and note Reference Number 12 and Col. 5, lines 30-52**). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the use of a dual-sided input panel as taught by Ostegard in the electronic device taught by Madsen and Yamazaki in order to make the overall size of the electronic device more compact.

As to Claim 19, Ostergard teaches wherein the bottom side input means exposed while the in the closed position and comprising a numerical keypad (**Ostegard—See Figs. 2a and 2b and note Reference Number 12 and Col. 5, lines 30-52**).

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rodney Amadiz whose telephone number is (571) 272-7762. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (571) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

R.A.
1/3/07
Division 2629

Sumati Lefkowitz
SUMATI LEFKOWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER